



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/707,225	11/06/2000	Ralph Victor Bain		8358
27234	7590	12/03/2004		
RALPH V. BAIN 39908 SAN SIMEON COURT FREMONT, CA 94539-3619			EXAMINER PARTHASARATHY, PRAMILA	
			ART UNIT 2136	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/707,225

Applicant(s)

BAIN, RALPH VICTOR

Examiner

Pramila Parthasarathy

Art Unit

2136

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.


NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: NONE.Claim(s) objected to: NONE.Claim(s) rejected: 1 - 3 and 5 - 9.Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☒ Other: See attachment


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Advisory Action

1. This office action is in response to the after-final request for reconsideration filed on November 12, 2004. Applicant's request for consideration has been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

The applicant in regards to claim 1, argue that the cited prior art (CPA) [Chang U.S. Patent 6,105,012, hereinafter "Chang"] does not disclose, "a method for automatically operating a decryption function within a web site page" and "providing the data within said web site page for validating an associated key for said cryptogram". These arguments are not found persuasive.

Chang teaches a method for automatically operating a decryption function within a web site page and providing the data within said web site page for validating an associated key for said cryptogram (Chang Column 2 lines 20 – 45; Column 9 lines 5 – 51 and Column 12 lines 37 – 49).

The applicant in regards to the amended claim 2, argue that the Chang does not disclose "the availability of a plurality of said decrypted versions within each said web site page in a plurality of said web site pages in a web site, whereby all said decrypted versions are available for display in the original position of their corresponding said cryptograms within said web site". This argument is not found persuasive.

Chang teaches the availability of a plurality of said decrypted versions within each said web site page in a plurality of said web site pages in a web site, whereby all

said decrypted versions are available for display in the original position of their corresponding said cryptograms within said web site (Chang Column 8 lines 7 – 20).

The applicant in regards to claim 3, argue that the cited prior art Chang does not disclose, “a cryptogram is of any size up to the size allowed by HTML standards for the body of said web site page”. This argument is not found persuasive.

Chang teaches a cryptogram is of any size up to the size allowed by HTML standards for the body of said web site page (Chang Column 2 lines 30 – 38 and Column 4 lines 2 – 20). Supporting secondary CPA Lincke et al. (U.S. Patent 6,253,326, hereinafter “Lincke”) discloses a method for producing a decrypted display of a cryptogram within a web site page, wherein said cryptogram is of any size up to the size allowed by HTML standards for said web site page (Lincke Column 11 lines 50 – Column 12 line 22).

The applicant in regards to claim 5, argue that the Chang does not disclose “decryption function obtains said associated key from a plurality of said associated keys, whereby each of said plurality of said web site pages contains within itself the means for independently decrypting a plurality of said cryptograms”. This argument is not found persuasive.

Chang teaches decryption function obtains said associated key from a plurality of said associated keys, whereby each of said plurality of said web site pages contains

within itself the means for independently decrypting a plurality of said cryptograms (Chang Column 5 lines 20 – 45 and Column 10 lines 38 – 53).

The applicant in regards to claim 6, argue that the Chang does not disclose “a human operator provides said plurality of said associated keys, comprising: a first means for sending an input request to said human operator, a second means for receiving said plurality of said associated keys directly into said web site page” and “allow a human operator to determine which of said plurality of said cryptograms are decrypted”. These arguments are not found persuasive.

Chang teaches a human operator provides said plurality of said associated keys, comprising: a first means for sending an input request to said human operator, a second means for receiving said plurality of said associated keys directly into said web site page” and “allow a human operator to determine which of said plurality of said cryptograms are decrypted (Chang Column 5 lines 23 – 45 and Column 6 lines 57 – 64).

The applicant in regards to claim 7, argue that Chang does not disclose “human operator receives a validity report directly from said decryption function upon entry of each said associated key, whereby said human operator is afforded the convenience of receiving notices of the validity of each said key from said web site page itself. These arguments are not found persuasive.

Chang teaches human operator receives a validity report directly from said decryption function upon entry of each said associated key, whereby said human operator is afforded the convenience of receiving notices of the validity of each said key from said web site page itself (Column 11 line 60 – Column 12 line 10).

The applicant in regards to claim 8, argue that Chang does not disclose “plurality of associated keys are made available to said plurality of said web site pages in said web site, comprising: a frameset page which will establish communication between said plurality of said web site pages if not already established”, “a third means which will distribute said plurality of said associated keys to all said web site pages as they are displayed” and “the convenience of entering said plurality of said associated keys in a single declaration”. These arguments are not found persuasive.

Chang teaches plurality of associated keys are made available to said plurality of said web site pages in said web site, comprising: a frameset page which will establish communication between said plurality of said web site pages if not already established, a third means which will distribute said plurality of said associated keys to all said web site pages as they are displayed and the convenience of entering said plurality of said associated keys in a single declaration (Column 1 line 66 – Column 2 line 55).

The applicant in regards to claim 9, argue that Chang does not disclose “wherein said decryption function operates only on the first instance of said cryptogram being found within said web site, whereby said human operator is requested to enter said

plurality of said associated keys only if an instance of said web site page is encountered while said human operator is browsing said web site". This argument is not found persuasive.

Chang teaches a method for automatically operating a decryption function within a web site page wherein said decryption function operates only on the first instance of said cryptogram being found within said web site, whereby said human operator is requested to enter said plurality of said associated keys only if an instance of said web site page is encountered while said human operator is browsing said web site (Column 2 lines 56 – 66 and Column 8 line 60 – Column 9 line 3).

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pramila Parthasarathy whose telephone number is 571-272-3866. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday (8:00am – 5pm).


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/707,225
Art Unit: 2136

Page 7

Pramila Parthasarathy

November 23, 2004.


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
PRIMARY EXAMINER